



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/902,066	07/10/2001	Joseph Weinberger	118-004F	1252

26633 7590 04/26/2005

HELLER EHRMAN WHITE & MCAULIFFE LLP
1717 RHODE ISLAND AVE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20036-3001

EXAMINER

POON, KING Y

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 04/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

W

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/902,066	Applicant(s) WEINBERGER ET AL.	
	Examiner King Y. Poon	Art Unit 2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) King Y. Poon. (3) _____
(2) Donald L. Monin, Jr. (47,256). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 19 April 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: proposed amendment.

Claim(s) discussed: as shown in the proposed amendment.

Identification of prior art discussed: Kravette.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: as shown in the proposed amendment, amendment to certain claims need to be made to further clarify the claimed subject matter, examiner will make final determination regarding prior art rejection upon receiving official response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


KING Y. POON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

HellerEhrman

ATTORNEYS

1666 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006-1228
Main: (202) 912-2000
Fax: (202) 912-2020

Facsimile Transmittal

To: Examiner King Y. POON, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office – Group Art Unit: 2624
Telephone: 703-305-0893 **Fax:** 571-273-7440

From: Donald L. Monin, Jr.
Telephone: (202) 912-2735

No. of Pages: 21 (including cover)
Date: April 14, 2005 3788/40498-0011

Message:

Examiner Poon:

As per our earlier conversation this morning, attached are the interview request form and proposed Amendment.

Best Available Copy

The information contained in this communication is intended only for the use of the addressee and may be confidential, may be attorney-client privileged and may constitute inside information. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited, and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error or you have not received all pages, please call the sender immediately at (202) 912-2000.

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP www.hewm.com

PTOL-413A (08-04)
 Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0851-0031
 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: _____ First Named Applicant: _____
 Examiner: _____ Art Unit: _____ Status of Application: _____

Tentative Participants:

(1) _____ (2) _____
 (3) _____ (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: _____ Proposed Time: _____ (AM/PM)

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☐ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

 Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

 Examiner/SPE Signature

 Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

 Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

DRAFT

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of:
Joseph Weinberger et al.

Confirmation No.: 1252

Serial No.: 09/902,066

Art Unit: 2624

Filed: July 10, 2001

Examiner: King Y. Poon

For: SYSTEM FOR AUTOMATICALLY MONITORING COPIERS FROM A REMOTE
LOCATION

AMENDMENT AND REPLY

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicants herein respond to the Office Action mailed December 23, 2004 (Paper No. 20041213) for the above-captioned application. Applicants also Petition for a one-month Extension of Time and provide the requisite fees herewith to extend the period for response to April 23, 2005. While Applicants believe that the correct payment for the extension of time fee is attached, the Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 08-1641. Please amend the present application as set forth in the Amendments below.

Best Available Copy

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

Amendments

In the Specification

Please amend the first paragraph of the specification under the heading of REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS as follows:

This application is a continuation of application Serial No. 09/421,992, filed October 19, 1999 now U.S. Patent No. 6,282,383, which was a continuation of application Serial No. 08/724,640, filed October 1, 1996, now U.S. Patent No. 6,009,284, which was a continuation of application Serial No. 08/478,357, filed June 7, 1995, now U.S. Patent No. 5,603,060, which was a continuation of application Serial No. 08/247,591, filed May 23, 1994, now abandoned, which was a continuation of application Serial No. 07/978,278, filed November 18, 1992, now U.S. Patent No. 5,333,286, which was a division of application Serial No. 07/567,388, filed August 14, 1990, now U.S. Patent No. 5,214,772, which was a continuation-in-part of application Serial No. 07/450,605, filed December 13, 1989, now U.S. Patent No. 5,084,875. This application is a continuation of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/421,992, filed October 19, 1999 now U.S. Patent No. 6,282,383, which is hereby incorporated by reference. This application is related to Serial No. 07/450,605, filed December 13, 1989, which is incorporated here by reference.

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

In the Claims:

Please amend the claims as follows:

Claims 1-15 (Canceled).

16. (Currently Amended) A copier system comprising:

a copier capable of being monitored by a personal computer from a remote location, the copier comprising a control computer controlling the performance of the copier, and a control panel configured to receive data from the control computer;

a chip corresponding to the copier, the chip providing an interface for connecting the copier with a bi-directional network, said bi-directional network being capable of connecting the personal computer to a plurality of devices, and

a memory device corresponding to the copier, the memory device storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier in the network, the memory device capable of retaining data if power to the memory device is removed,

wherein said chip transmits the special information ~~when transmitted~~ to the personal computer and identifies the copier remotely in the network and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager of the personal computer.

17. (Currently Amended) The copier system according to claim 16, wherein the chip converts ~~has first circuitry for converting~~ serial data transmitted from the personal computer into parallel data and converts ~~converting~~ parallel data transmitted from the copier into serial data, ~~and second circuitry for driving a pair of signal lines according to the converted serial data, the first and second circuitry being incorporated in the chip.~~

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

18. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 16, further comprising the network wherein the network comprises a plurality of lines, each of the plurality of lines having at least a pair of signal lines transmitting asynchronous serial data.
19. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 18, wherein the plurality of lines comprise four signal lines comprising the pair of signal lines.
20. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 19, wherein the pair of signal lines comprise a hard wiring.
21. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 18, wherein the pair of signal lines has high immunity from external noise sources.
22. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 18, wherein the control computer is mounted on a computer board.
23. (Cancelled).
24. (Cancelled).
25. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 18, wherein the chip comprises a microprocessor.
26. (Currently Amended) The copier system according to claim 25, wherein the microprocessor is connected to comprises an address decoder.
27. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claims 18, further comprising the personal computer, wherein a condition of the copier and setup parameters, a copy count and error codes of the copier are displayed on a display screen of the personal computer.
28. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claims 18, wherein the control panel comprises a light emitting diode.

Heller Ehrman White & McCaulliffe LLP
 Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

29. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claims 18, wherein the control panel comprises a liquid crystal display.

30. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 18, wherein the control panel comprises a plurality of keys.

31. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 18, wherein an error status signal is sent from the control computer to the control panel.

32. (Currently Amended) A copier system capable of being monitored and controlled by a remote computer, the copier system ~~image-forming device~~ comprising:

a copier machine;

a computer controller housed in ~~coupled to~~ the copier machine and configured to generate ~~monitor~~ a status of the copier machine; and

an interface for connecting the copier system ~~image-forming device~~ with the remote computer by a bi-directional communication line connected to the remote computer, the interface comprising:

a ~~chip comprising~~ a microprocessor;

a ~~nonvolatile~~ memory storing a special information and being capable of retaining ~~the special information if power to the copier system is removed;~~

a ~~parallel-to-serial converter~~ circuit for converting a first parallel data stream from the microprocessor into a first serial data stream[[:]] and a ~~serial-to-parallel converter~~ ~~circuit~~ for converting a second serial data stream from the remote computer into a second parallel data stream which the microprocessor processes[[:]]; and

Best Available Copy

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

a driver circuit capable of transmitting the first serial data stream over the bi-directional communication line,

wherein the special information identifies the copier and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager operating on the remote ~~personal~~ computer.

33. (Currently Amended) The copier system according to claim 32, wherein the microprocessor is connected to ~~comprises~~ an address decoder.

34. (Previously Presented) The copier system according to claim 32, wherein the remote computer comprises a personal computer.

35. (Currently Amended) The copier system according to claim 32, wherein the status of the copier machine monitored by the remote computer ~~controller~~ comprises at least one of setup parameters, a copy count and error codes of the copier, and wherein data representing at least one of the setup parameters, copy count and error codes of the copier are transmitted via the interface to the remote computer in a format enabling a representation of the data to be displayed on a display screen of the remote ~~personal~~ computer.

36. (New) A copier system comprising:

a copier capable of being monitored by a personal computer from a remote location, the personal computer being connected to the copier system via a network, the network comprising a pair of wires to bi-directionally transmit serial data;

a memory corresponding to the copier, the memory storing a special information to identify the copier and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager operating on the personal computer, the memory being capable of retaining data if power to the memory is removed; and

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

a universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter for transmitting the special information to the personal computer through the network, the universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter converting parallel data used by said copier into serial data to be placed on the pair of wires.

37. (New) The copier system according to claim 36, wherein a status of the copier monitored by the personal computer comprises at least one of setup parameters, a copy count and error codes of the copier, and wherein data representing at least one of the setup parameters, copy count and error codes of the copier are transmitted via the universal asynchronous receiver/transmitter to the personal computer to be displayed on a display screen of the personal computer.

Best Available Copy

Heller Ehrman White & McAnuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a).

Claims 17-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 32-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention.

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,077,582 to Kravette et al. in view of U.S. Patent Reissue No. 31,222 to McCracken, U.S. Patent No. 3,975,712 to Hepworth et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,644,478 to Stephens et al.

Claims 18-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,077,582 to Kravette et al. in view of U.S. Patent Reissue No. 31,222 to McCracken, U.S. Patent No. 3,975,712 to Hepworth et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,644,478 to Stephens et al. as applied to claim 16, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,625,077 to Biffle et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

A Petition for an Unintentionally Delayed Domestic Priority Claim under 37 C.F.R. § 1.78(a)(3) is being concurrently submitted. The delayed claim for priority dates back through related applications to the December 13, 1989 filing of application Serial No. 07/450,605, now.

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

U.S. Patent No. 5,084,875. The specification has been amended to indicate the relationship of the related applications and application Serial No. 07/450,605 to the present application.

Claims 16, 17, 26, 32, 33 and 35 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 1-15 remain cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 23 and 24 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 36 and 37 have been added. Accordingly, claims 16-22 and 25-37 are presently pending for consideration on the merits.

The Drawings Do Not Contain Objectionable Subject Matter

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In particular, the Office Action asserts at page 2 that five specific features of the claims are not shown in the drawings. Further, the Office Action requires that the specific features must be shown in the drawings or canceled from the claims.

First, the Office Action asserts that the feature of "wherein the control computer and the chip are separate chips" is not shown in the drawings. By way of the foregoing amendment, Applicants have cancelled claim 23, which is the only claim that recited such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection is now moot.

Second, the Office Action asserts that the feature of "wherein the chip has first circuitry for converting serial data transmitted from the personal computer into parallel data and converting parallel data transmitted from the copier into serial data, and second circuitry for driving a pair of signal lines according to the converted serial data, the first and second circuitry being incorporated in the chip" is not shown in the drawings. By way of the foregoing

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498:0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

amendment, Applicants have amended claim 17, which is the only claim that recited such a feature. More specifically, Applicants have amended claim 17 to recited "wherein the chip converts serial data transmitted from the personal computer into parallel data and converts parallel data transmitted from the copier into serial data." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection is now moot.

Third, the Office Action asserts that the feature of "wherein a condition of the copier and setup parameters, a copy count and error codes of the copier are displayed on a display screen of the personal computer" is not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection to the drawings because this feature is clearly shown in the drawings. For example, Figure 21 of the present application shows elements on a display screen, such as "ID: 001", "TYPES: X-1025", "LOCATION: LAB", "STATUS: OFFLINE" and "NUMBER TO COPY: 00". Further, Figure 22 clearly shows a display listing of error codes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection is not proper. If the Examiner persists in maintaining this objection, Applicants respectfully request a more detailed explanation of why the feature of "wherein a condition of the copier and setup parameters, a copy count and error codes of the copier are displayed on a display screen of the personal computer" is considered to be not shown in the drawings.

Fourth, the Office Action asserts that the feature of "wherein the chip comprises a RAM" is not shown in the drawings. By way of the foregoing amendment, Applicants have cancelled claim 24, which is the only claim that recited such a feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection is now moot.

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

Fifth, the Office Action asserts that the feature of "wherein the chip comprises a microprocessor" is not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully traverse this objection of the drawing because this feature is clearly shown in the drawings. For example, Figure 8 and page 10, lines 6-10 of the present application indicate that a CPU 22 is in a chip. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that this objection is improper. If the Examiner persists in maintaining this objection, Applicants respectfully request a more detailed explanation of why the feature of "wherein the chip comprises a microprocessor" is considered to be not shown in the drawings.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the objections to the drawings should be withdrawn. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that no drawing changes are necessary because the objections to the drawings are either moot as a result of the foregoing amendment to the claims or improper.

All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 17-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Further, the Office Action alleges that seven of the claims have subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, specific features of claims 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 26 are alleged at pages 3-5 of the Office Action to not be supported by the specification of the present application.

Best Available Copy

Heller Ehrman White & McCulliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

First, the Office Action alleges that the feature of "wherein the chip has first circuitry for converting serial data transmitted from the personal computer into parallel data and converting parallel data transmitted from the copier into serial data, and second circuitry for driving a pair of signal lines according to the converted serial data, the first and second circuitry being incorporated in the chip" in claim 17 is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. By way of the foregoing amendment, Applicants have amended claim 17, to recite "wherein the chip converts serial data transmitted from the personal computer into parallel data and converts parallel data transmitted from the copier into serial data." Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at page 15, lines 14-15 and page 20, lines 21-28 of the present application. Support can also be found, for example in Fig. 8, as well as, at page 13, lines 11-23 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 17 is now moot.

Second, the Office Action alleges that the feature of "wherein the network comprises a plurality of lines, each of the plurality of lines having at least a pair of signals transmitting asynchronous serial data" in claim 18 is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the present application clearly supports this feature. For example, Figure 1 of the present application discloses a plurality of lines 52 that are configured into a "star-shaped" network. Further, Figures 7 and 8, as well as, page 13, lines 11-23 of the

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

present application disclose a driver with paired differential output that is used with the RS422 industrial standard interfacing protocol. The element 50 in Figure 8 consisting of an input line connected to a triangle together with small circles on the triangle at the positive output line and the negative output line represent an RS-422 line driver. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 18 is not proper. If the Examiner persists in maintaining this rejection, Applicants respectfully request a more detailed explanation of why the feature of "wherein the network comprises a plurality of lines, each of the plurality of lines having at least a pair of signals transmitting asynchronous serial data" is considered to be not shown in the specification.

Third, the Office Action alleges that the feature of "wherein the control computer and the chip are separate chips" in claim 23 is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. By way of the foregoing amendment, Applicants have cancelled claim 23. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 23 is now moot.

Fourth, the Office Action alleges that the feature of "wherein the chip comprises a RAM" in claim 24 is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. By way of the foregoing amendment, Applicants have cancelled claim 24. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 24 is now moot.

Heller Ehrman White & McCulliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

Fifth, the Office Action alleges that the feature of "wherein the chip comprises a microprocessor" in claim 25 is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the present application clearly supports this feature. For example, Figure 8, as well as, page 10, lines 6-10 of the present application clearly disclose a chip with a microprocessor. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 25 is not proper. If the Examiner persists in maintaining this rejection, Applicants respectfully request a more detailed explanation of why the feature of "wherein the chip comprises a microprocessor" is considered to be not shown in the specification.

Sixth, the Office Action alleges that the feature of "wherein the microprocessor comprises an address decoder" in claim 26 is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. By way of the foregoing amendment, Applicants have amended claim 26 to recite "wherein the microprocessor is connected to an address decoder." Support can also be found, for example in Fig. 8, as well as, at page 13, lines 11-23 of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 26 is now moot.

Seventh, the Office Action alleges that the feature of "wherein a condition of the copier and setup parameters, a copy count and error codes of the copier are displayed on a display screen of the personal computer" in claim 27 is subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the present application clearly supports this feature. For example, Figure 21 of the present application shows elements on a display screen, such as "ID: 001", "TYPES: X-1025", "LOCATION: LAB", "STATUS: OFFLINE" and "NUMBER TO COPY: 00". Further, Figure 22 of the present application clearly shows a display listing of error codes. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 27 is improper. If the Examiner persists in maintaining this rejection, Applicants respectfully request a more detailed explanation of why the feature of "wherein a condition of the copier and setup parameters, a copy count and error codes of the copier are displayed on a display screen of the personal computer" is considered to be not shown in the specification.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejections should be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 32-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. At page 5 of the Office Action, claim 32 was rejected because the phrase the meaning of "image forming device" is allegedly unclear. Claims 33-35 were rejected for the same reason because of their dependence on claim 32. By way of the foregoing Amendment, Applicants have changed "image forming device" in claim 32 to "copier system". Applicants respectfully submit that the phrase "copier system" is clear since the present

Heller Ehrman White & McAnuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/002,066
In re Weinberger et al.

application discloses a system for a copier. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 32, as well as dependent claims 33-35, be withdrawn.

All Claims Comply With 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,077,582 to Kravette et al. in view of U.S. Patent Reissue No. 31,222 to McCracken, U.S. Patent No. 3,975,712 to Hepworth et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,644,478 to Stephens et al. To the extent that the Examiner may consider this rejection to still apply to independent claim 16, as amended, Applicants traverse this rejection as being based on upon references that neither describe nor suggest the novel combination of features now recited in independent claim 16, as amended. For example, amended independent claim 16 now recites, amongst other features, "a memory device corresponding to the copier, the memory device storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier in the network, the memory device capable of retaining data if power to the memory device is removed." Support for such a feature is found, for example, at page 10, lines 11-34 of the present application.

In contrast to the presently claimed invention, Kravette et al. discloses at column 11, lines 53-60 that RAM 102 is used to store identification data. Applicants respectfully submit that RAM does not retain information without power. Thus, Kravette et al. fails to disclose "the memory device capable of retaining data if power to the memory device is removed" because the RAM 102 of Kravette et al. would not retain identification data if power to the memory device is removed.

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

Applicants also respectfully submit that McCracken, Hepworth et al. and Stephens et al. do not cure the deficiencies of Kravette et al. as discussed above with regard to newly-amended independent claim 16. More specifically, Kravette et al., either separately or combined with McCracken, Hepworth et al. and/or Stephens et al., do not describe or suggest "a memory device corresponding to the copier, the memory device storing data comprising a special information to identify the copier in the network, the memory device capable of retaining data if power to the memory device is removed."

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 16 is improper because Kravette et al., either alone or in combination with McCracken, Hepworth et al. and/or Stephens et al., do not teach or suggest all of the features recited in independent claim 16, as amended. Moreover, dependent claim 17 is allowable for the same reasons as discussed above with regard to its base claim 16 and for the additional features that claim 17 recites. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 16 and 17 be withdrawn.

Claims 18-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,077,582 to Kravette et al. in view of U.S. Patent Reissue No. 31,222 to McCracken, U.S. Patent No. 3,975,712 to Hepworth et al. and U.S. Patent No. 4,644,478 to Stephens et al. as applied to claim 16, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,625,077 to Biffle et al. To the extent that the Examiner may consider this rejection to still apply, Applicants respectfully assert that the Biffle et al. reference applied in this 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection does not cure the deficiencies of Kravette et al. as discussed above with regard to independent claim 16. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 18-31 are allowable at least because of their

Heller Ehrman White & MacLiff LLP
Attorney Docket No. 040498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

dependence on independent claim 16, and for the additional features that they recite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 18-31 be withdrawn.

New Claim 36 is Patentable

Applicants respectfully submit that new claim 36 is at least allowable because none of the prior art of record describes or suggests "a memory corresponding to the copier, the memory storing a special information to identify the copier and enables recognition of the copier by a database manager operating on the personal computer, the memory capable of retaining data if power to the memory is removed." Further, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments above with regard to independent claim 16 are also applicable to independent claim 36. Dependent claim 37 is allowable at least for the same reasons that independent claim 36 is allowable, and for the additional features that it recites.

Best Available Copy

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
Attorney Docket No. 030498-0011

U.S. Serial No. 09/902,066
In re Weinberger et al.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

By: _____

Customer No. 26633

Johnny A. Kumar
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No.: 34,649

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
1666 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20006-4004
Telephone: (202) 912-2510
Facsimile: (202) 912-2020